

| | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 09/064,057 | Applicant(s) Gerard et al. |
| | Examiner Maryam Monshipouri | Group Art Unit 1652 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Maryam Monshipouri _____ (3) _____
 (2) Brian DelBuono _____ (4) _____

Date of Interview Feb 21, 2001

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement was reached. was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 26, 28, 33, 40, and 117-126

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The first issue discussed was whether the recombinant enzyme is likely to maintain activities that are comparable to enzyme isolated from its natural source. In other words, would one of ordinary skill in the art be expecting a reasonable degree of success in preparing recombinant ASLV with specific activities of at least 30,000 units permilligram. Mr. Delbuono indicated that Soltis reference teaches that recombinant expression of individual subunits of ASLV was difficult because proteins were expressed in inclusion bodies and could not be reconstituted as active enzymes. Thus, based on this teaching one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to prepare ASLV reverse transcriptase with activities as claimed.

The second issue discussed was the filing of terminal disclaimer for overcoming the double patenting rejection. Mr. Delbuono promised to discuss this matter with the applicant and file a disclaimer as soon as possible.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.